CLASSICAL ARMENIAN CULTURE
Influences and Creativity
Proceedings of the First Dr. H. Markarian Conference on Armenian Culture

Edited by
Thomas J. Samuelian

© 1982
University of Pennsylvania
Armenian Texts and Studies

LEGENDS ABOUT CONSTANTINE IN ARMENIAN

Michael van Esbroeck

Bollandist Fathers, Brussels (Belgium)

At the end of the last century, such prominent historians as Louis Duchesne, A. L. Frothingham and F. Conybeare were convinced that Movsēs Xorenac'i's History was written in the middle of the fifth century.[1] Consequently, the legends about Constantine's conversion and the Inventio (recovery) of the Holy Cross, and that of the baptism of the Emperor by Saint Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, were sometimes dated or situated in the early fifth century, simply because Movsēs Xorenac'i's History was the only one available. Since Movsēs quoted the "Doctrine of Addai" and the reports of Agat'angełos concerning the conversion of King Trdat, both books were themselves viewed as reliable sources dating from the fourth century.

The work of A. von Gutschmid, P. Vetter, H. Gelzer and A. Carrière already showed how difficult it was to prove that Movsēs' account was really an ancient one.[2] In 1913, F. Dölger issued a statement on Constantine's baptism in which Agat'angełos is reduced to an echo of a basically Greco-Roman tale.[3] Far more complete is the analysis made by W. Levison in 1923, which checks the Latin manuscripts of the Sylvester legend.[4] The oriental part of that study seems to remain unchallenged by further publications. It was composed by Levison with the acknowledged aid of A. Ehrhard for Greek sources and A. Baumstark for oriental reports.

The articles of Dölger and Levison throw no light upon the means by which the legends of Constantine grew up in the East. They do not explain the reasons which led Armenian historians to express the experience of the new official religion in the emblematic terms already familiar in the traditions of the Roman Empire. In converting the Roman world, theocratic symbols played a role analogous to those used by pagan forerunners in establishing the eminence of any one Roman emperor over his predecessor. In the pagan Tetrarchy, we know that Galen was proclaimed as offspring of Jupiter, and Constans, Constantine's father, that of Hercules. After Maximian's death, Constantine claimed to be the protégé of Sol Invictus and

79

Apollo, and he attributed his right to victory to the supreme divinity. That symbol of victory, as everybody knows, was to be superseded by the monogram of the Cross with the words en toutōi nika.

Not even that new Christian sign stopped the search for a more imposing guarantee of legitimacy. In his letter to Constans II, Cyril of Jerusalem claimed for the semi-Arian emperor a higher symbol of victory than that of Constantine himself. In the holy city of Jerusalem, Constantine alone succeeded in digging the Cross up from the earth, but Constans II was honored by seeing a burning Cross of light in the sky over Jerusalem![5] Such a rivalry among the symbols of the conversion of the Emperor not only continues the pagan habit of invoking higher divinities, it also gives us the key to the interpretation of use of symbols in the story of the conversion of Trdat and the Armenian kingdom.

Since the formulation of the claim is not expressed with the same words in every Greek source, the description of the Vision of Constantine has to be observed with the greatest care in Armenian as well. With this in mind, it seems possible to draw the chronological limits within which the Armenian reports were written. On one hand, the Greek and Roman stories ought to be read in a definite order, and on the other, it is clear that the Armenian Agat'angełos was compiled from several distinct redactional levels long before Movsēs Xorenac'i made his own Chronicle at the beginning of the eighth century.

Such are the general grounds for wishing to attempt to understand better the relationship of Armenia to the Roman Empire from the fourth to the seventh centuries. For simplicity, I shall first treat the Vision of Constantine, the major symbol of the Empire's conversion. In a second phase, our attention will be concentrated upon the records of the Inventio of the Cross, with special reference to the Armenian position in relation to the general diffusion of that legend in the Middle East. Finally, we shall consider the Legend of Sylvester and its influence on the various stages of Agat'angełos.

*   *   *

The most ancient testimony of Constantine's Vision is Lactantius' record ca. 318 A. D. Before the battle against Maxentius in Rome, the Emperor is asked in his sleep to engrave the caeleste signum upon the shields of the warriors.[6] In his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius speaks only of this same sign, sōterion sēmeion, which was held in the hand of Constantine's

statue at the Milvian bridge in Rome.[7]   Yet Lactantius already knew of celestial aid granted to Licinius: an angel gave him the victory over Maximianus Daia in 313, at Campus Ergenus, where the enemy was certainly a real persecutor of Christians.[8]   The report of Eusebius' Vita Constantini, which was left unfinished ca. 337, gives a description of that signum which matches Lactantius' description very well: tropaion ek phōtos sunistamenon, graphēn te autō sunephthai legousan: toutōi nika![9]

In the beginning of the fifth century, Rufinus gives a parallel story: Constantine dreams that he sees in the East in caelo signum crucis igneo fulgore rutilare, and the angels come and say to him: toutōi nika![10]   These angels seem to have been borrowed from Licinius' campaign of 313. Otherwise, the statement of Rufinus does not improve the vision of the Vita Coinstantini.   Socrates, however, uses an original wording: eiden en tōi ouranōi stulon phōtos stauroeidē en ōi grammata ēn legonta: en toutōi nika![11]   This expression is very carefully translated by Philo Tirakac'i in the seventh century, ca. 696 A. D.:   Etes yerknis xač'ajew siwn lusoy yorum ǎnt'ernoyr aṙeal: aysu yaḷt'ea.[12]   This revelation, like that of Rufinus, is placed before the battle with Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge.

The Vita Constantini, however, considers that the victory occurred in Gaul, clearly in order to avoid the mention of a pagan guarantor, the god Apollo in Treves. Medals were struck linking the monogram and the military success in Gaul in 313. There is a good chance that Socrates is not drawing in this passage, on Eusebius' Vita, even though he quotes Eusebius several times in his first book.   A comparison of the Vita Metrophani et Alexandri with the Syntagma of Gelasius of Cyzicus, written ca. 475 A. D., shows that the words of Socrates may depend on the lost History of Gelasius of Caesarea,[13] the nephew of Cyril of Jerusalem, who was working about 380 A. D. Both are speaking of Maxentius' battle with to sōterion tou staurou sumbolon phōtoeidē en ouranōi.[14]   Sozomenos, although a contemporary of Socrates, juxtaposes the reports of Rufinus with that of the Vita of Eusebius.[15]

Before these major historians, another form of the Vision appeared in the History written by Philostorgius, the Eunomian philosopher and the personal enemy of Basil of Caesarea.   The passage of his Chronicle is only available in the brief resume given by Photius, together with quotations from the History, both to be found in the Vita Constantini edited by I. Guidi and in the Passio Artemii.[16] Three differences affect the structure of the Vision:

(1) the Cross appears like lightning, brighter thn the sun; (2) the inscription is made of stars in the form of a rainbow; (3) it is written in Roman letters: to tou staurou sēmeion uper ton ēlion exastrapton, kai asterōn auton kuklōi peritheontōn iridos tropōi.[17]   This new form is connected with that of Constans II which appeared twice simultaneously, one in Pannonia at Mursa in the battle against Magnentius in the year 351 A. D., and the other at Golgotha, from the high point in the sky, extending towards the summit of the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. In Mursa, as in Jerusalem, according to Philostorgius, the rainbow, the symbol of reconciliation, and the crown, the symbol of victory, stand shining in the sky.[18]   The Eunomian historian wrote about 430, but he was basing his accounts on an older source, the so-called "homoean-anonymous" chronicle, whose story intended to glorify Constans II during the reign of Valens, about 380.[19]

The first and the best source for the Vision in Jerusalem is naturally Cyril's Letter to the Emperor Constans II. The words toutōi nika are never mentioned in Jerusalem.[20]   There we find the allusion to the lightning whose radiance is greater than that of the sun, and the description could suggest the form of a rainbow, of which no mention is made at all. The Jerusalem vision is followed by the conversion of a number of people.

The last and most widespread legend in Greek is the prologue to the story of the Inventio of the Cross, whose first words read: "The seventh year of the reign on Constantine the great king, in the month of January, innumerable crowds of barbarians gathered together at the river Danube, seeking to cross the river and to destroy all the country to the East . . ."[21] The Emperor sees at night starou sebas ieron uperanōthen lampon echon epigraphēn di' asterōn . . ." the sacred wonder of the Cross shining from above, having an inscription made of stars." This very short text is already found at the head of the Inventio, in the Greek MS of Sinai, written in the eighth century. It is followed by the Letter of Cyril and a series of other old texts concerning the Cross and Saint Stephen.[22]   Many copies of the prologue existed, not only in Greek, but in other langauges. We naturally find it in Armenian too. The translation of the vision sounds less accurate than that of Philo: zawrinag astuacełēn xač'in i verust p'ayleal, or unēr vernagir astełeay: aynu yałt'ea[23] "the divinely modeled sign of the Cross, shining from above and having the inscription of stars: by that sign you shall vanquish!"

This résumé exists in a parallel Georgian version which dates back to

their oldest translations.[24] It is found in Syriac in two different versions, if
not in very old manuscripts, at least in valuable collections.[25] One of these
texts is even inserted between the two legends of the Inventio of the Cross,
the first one under Emperor Claudius, the second one by Helen, Constantine's
wife. A fragment of the Syriac version was found in Sogdian.[26] Lastly this
legend exists in a genuine form in the Latin palimpsest MS of the sixth or
seventh century, the Paris. Lat. 2769.[27] If the vision is placed in the sixth
year of Constantine, this following description itself is the oldest version:
vidit signum crucis Christi ex lumine claro constitutum et super litteris
scriptum titulum.[28] That formula is closer to that of Eusebius' Vita. The
existence of a Greek model for this Latin statement is beyond any doubt. Its
oriental origin is clear because it claims Constantine's baptism by "Eusebius"
of Rome, in the form which was bound to provoke the Roman reaction by
producing the legend of Sylvester, the only true pope at the time of
Constantine's conversion.

The role of the Latin legend is crucial in finding the structure of the
Inventio, but before going further, let us consider the two traditions
concerning the narration of Agat'angełos. First, the stars outshining the sun
come from the anonymous homoean source ca. 380 A. D., under the influence
of the Letter of Cyril, ca. 351 A. D., and Philostorgius claims a Latin origin,
speaking of Roman characters. This form is perpetuated in the prologue to
the Inventio by Helena which considers Eusebius bishop of Rome. Secondly,
Rufinus invokes the titulum written in Greek characters, relying on an
oriental tradition.   The pillar of light, mentioned only by Socrates, is,
however, nearer to Gelasius' and Eusebius' accounts. The baptism of the
Emperor is mentioned only by Eusebius of Caesarea, and the bishop was,
indeed, Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Arian favorite of Constantine.[29]

The earliest form of Agat'angełos' History gives the Vision according
to the earliest form: stēlē de purinos ephanē en mesōi tōn udatōn staurou
tupon ekhousa.[30] The stele of fire appears in the middle of the water,
having the form of the Cross. But the Arabic text of Marr reads: the
"pillar," stulon[31] and not stēlē, and it is probable that such a confusion
occurred in Socrates' text. This vision is the main feature of the baptism
of Trdat by Gregory in Bagavan. The way in which the different shrines are
destroyed fits well with the oldest Latin document. The Cross brings about
the conversion of the people and the destruction of the shrines. As soon as
Constantine hears of that event, he sends priests to congratulate the new

Christian king and invites him to Rome, where Sylvester formerly gave him the baptism. During his journey to Rome, Constantine gives Trdat as the details of the vision of the Cross and of the victory.[32]

In the official text of the sixth century, the vision of the baptism at Bagavan runs as follows: ew loys sastik ereweal i nmanut'iwn sean lusawori, ew ekac' i veray jurc' getoyn ew i veray nora nmanut'iwn Tērunakan xač'in ew aynčap' cageac' loysn minč'ew argeloyr zčaṙagayt's aregakann ew nuaṙec'uc'anēr; kai phōsphodrotaton phanen kath'omoiōma stulou photoeidous estē epi tōn udatōn kai epano tou stulou to despotikon sēmeion. Epi tosouton de uperelampsen oste kai tas aktīnas tou ēliou kataluptein kai meiōsai "And a bright light appeared in the likeness of a shining pillar, and it stood over the waters of the river; and above it was the likeness of the Lord's cross. And the light shone out so brightly that it obscured and weakened the rays of the sun."[33] This second account uses the structure of the symbols in the Letter of Cyril in order to give prominence to the pillar already present in the first text. After Trdat hears of Constantine's conversion by Sylvester, Trdat and Gregory travel to Rome where Eusebius of Rome receives them with the greatest joy.[34]

In order to follow the various stages of Sylvester's becoming Eusebius of Rome, we first have to go back to the structure of the stories of the Inventio, and how the Armenian versions of them spread.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

According to the official historiography, Queen Helena built the church of the Anastasis, and that of Golgotha on the site of the temple of Aphrodite, which was erected by Hadrian when Aelia Capitolina was founded. The churches were inaugurated under Bishop Macarius in 355, during the thirtieth year of the reign of Constantine.[35] Ten years later, Cyril speaks of the fragments of the Cross dispersed all over the world.[36] Ca. 390 A. D., John Chrysostom knew that three crosses had been found. Without the aid of the inscription at the top of Christ's Cross, it would have been impossible to decide which of the three was the true one.[37] Already in 395, Ambrose refers to Queen Helena as the leading figure in the Inventio, but the titulum again made it possible to find the true Cross. The nails were already mentioned as being inserted in the bridle of the imperial horse.[38]

Rufinus, ca. 405 A. D., was the first to speak of a woman who was desperately ill. The titulum fell away from the Cross, and it was necessary to touch the sick woman with each of the three crosses to see which of them

would heal her.[39] This would be the true Cross. Before 402, Paulinus of Nola had given a longer report: the Queen inquires among the chief Jewish authorities of Jerusalem, and receives from them the information she wants. The true wood is revealed by the resurrection of a recens mortuus, a man who died not long before.[40]

Socrates and Theodoret give the history of bishop Macarius of Jerusalem and the old woman.[41] Sozomenus says a Jew was asked to show the place they ought to dig up when Macarius was still the bishop of Jerusalem.[42] The next form we have to analyze is the old Latin legend of Helena, the contents of which would have been known to Paulinus of Nola and Sulpicius Severus, ca. 400 A. D. As we have seen, the oldest Latin form places at its head Constantine's Vision on the bank of the Danube. This certainly avoided having to mention Licinius the Apostate in Pannonia, and helped to represent all the enemies of Christianity as being on the side of the barbarians. It was also an opportunity to recover the symbols of the vision which Constans II had on the bank of the Danube. Lastly, it was not too farfetched to identify Constantine's victory over the Goths in 332-333 with the statements of Eusebius' Vita, saying he was fighting against the Gauls at the moment of the vision.

According to Eusebius, Christ himself gives instructions to Constantine to engrave the monogram on the warriors' arms. Only the Latin text speaks of a Vir splendidissimus,[43] coming with the same instructions, perhaps as a substitute for the role of the angels in Licinius' campaign.   The few Christians in the army explain the teaching of Christ to Constantine. The Emperor summons Eusebius of Rome and receives baptism, destroys pagan shrines, and builds churches. The account of the baptism of Trdat by Gregory the Illuminator in Bagavan follows this pattern exactly.

Later, the Latin text presents Helena's journey to Jerusalem and the Inventio of the Cross as occurring on the 28th of the second month that is, according to the Syriac version, the month of Iyyar (May) 28th. Then follows a theological controversy. The Queen expounds the doctrine of Christ to the Jews. Fifty Jewish doctors are listening, and one of them, Judas, explains that his grandfather Zacchaeus transmitted to his father Simeon, and later Simeon to himself, the secret of the truth of Jesus as the Messiah. Judas is summoned to answer the Queen's questions. Since Judas does not know where the Cross is, he is thrown into a well where he remains for seven days. Afterwards, he agrees to find the place and makes a prayer in Hebrew to

obtain God's aid. An earthquake then takes place; sweet smells are emitted, and the digging begins. They find three crosses. A young man who died recently is brought back to life by the true Cross. Then, since Judas acquiesced to the orders of the Queen, Satan accuses him of treacherous behavior, and says that he will die a martyr under a future Emperor. Not long after, the bishop of Jerusalem dies, and the Queen appoints Eusebius, who was bishop of Rome, to annoint Judas bishop of Jerusalem, with the Christian name of Cyriacus, that is, "Dominicus." The finding of the nails follows that of the Cross. This story practically denies the presence of Macarius, whose name is found elsewhere. It represents the tradition best known to Paulinus ca. 402 in Western Europe.

The Inventio of the Cross by Cyriacus supposes the existence of two complementary statements: the martyrdom of Judas Cyriacus under Julian the Apostate, and the first Inventio by Protonikè, the wife of Claudius. Before reading these complements, let us glance at some of the documents which stress the antiquity of these legendary accounts.

In Greek, the vision which introduces Helena's legend is better adapted to the forms taken by Constans II's apparition, with the stars forming the letters en toutōi nika.[44]   That Greek account lies behind the versions in Georgian, Armenian, Sogdian, and Syriac. The oldest form, in Syriac, is well preserved in the unedited MS of Leningrad, N. S. 4, fol. 74-76,[45] of the sixth century, followed by Helena's legend in a text which corresponds very inexactly to that of the later MS Add. 14644, also of the sixth century, which was published by Nestlé.[46]   Both Syriac texts reproduce an old version of that combined legend. Another copy of Helena's legend was published by Bedjan from an unchecked manuscript.[47]   The two old Syriac codices are interesting because of the similarity of their content. It is worth remarking that Queen Helena found the Cross on Iyyar 28th, so that the second month mentioned in the Greek source depends on a Latin form of computation.

Some details are better described in the Syriac version: for instance, Saint Stephen is explicitly referred to as the brother of Judas' grandfather Zacchaeus. The parallel contents of the two sixth century manuscripts is striking. They include the Doctrine of Addai, the Doctrine of Saint Peter, Helena's legend and the Martyrdom of Judas Cyriacus. We also find the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles in the London MS. In the Leningrad Codex we find the Life of the Apostle John, the Story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, and an original composition about Gregory Thaumaturgus.[48]   The

common source of both collections is certainly to be traced back to the fifth century.   The story of the first Inventio of the Cross is included in the Doctrine of Addai,[49] and the second Inventio with its corollary on the nails announces the marytyrdom of Cyriacus.   The three legends are already together.   Reading the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, we can understand that the prominent figure here is Saint James, first bishop of Jerusalem,[50] just as Saint Peter is considered as the prominent figure in the Doctrine of Saint Peter which follows.

The London MS, which lacks the prologue on the Danube, inserts a special title before the Inventio: "Inventio of the Cross for the second time." Indeed, in the Doctrine of Addai, the first finding prepares for the second time in some details.   In a more recent Syriac MS, Add. 12174, from 1196 A. D., both legends are brought together with a new title given to the second Inventio, and without the prologue on Constantine's vision on the Danube: its second part is an exact reproduction of the wording of the Leningrad Codex, which preserved the sixth-century prologue This old one only relates both legends in a single history.[51]   An abstract of the Doctrine of Addai existed also in an isolated form in the Paris MS Syriac 234, published by Nestle, and in the Sachau MS 222, edited by Bedjan.[52]   They are late derivations with new considerations at the end of the story.

Summing up, we may say that the Protonikè legend exists first in the Doctrine of Addai, which was translated by Leroubna into Armenian, It was made independent by the connection with Helena's Inventio.   Let us proceed to the Protonikè legend.

The circumstances related by the legend are as follows: Protonikè, the wife of the emperor Claudius, sees the miracles of the Simon Peter in Rome and believes in Christ.   She goes from Rome to Jerusalem with her two sons and her only daughter.   She dwells in Herod's palace.   James, the bishop of the church, visits her, and she asks him to show her Golgotha and where the Cross is.   These are known to Onias ben Hanna, Gedalia ben Kaiapha and Juda ben Ebedshalom.   The Queen orders them to reveal the secret to James. When she enters the tomb in which Christ is believed to have been buried, her daughter suddenly dies.   Saying a prayer, she takes each of the three crosses and touches her daughter with them.   The third one, the true Cross, brings her daughter back to life.   She commands that a great building be erected on Golgotha.   The Jews and the Gentiles become very sad.   When Protonike comes back to Rome, Emperor Claudius commands that all the

Jews leave Italy. A short account of the event is sent by James to all the apostles.

In a somewhat abridged version of the first Inventio, this story, borrowed from the Doctrine, is extended by several episodes. With the persecutions against Christians in full force under Trajan's rule, the Jews see their opportunity and martyr Simeon ben Kleophas, bishop of Jerusalem. A certain Niketas then takes the Cross and gives it to the Jews, who conceal it in the earth at the depth of the height of twenty men. It was to be recovered a second time by the fifteenth bishop of Jerusalem, Judas, the last Jewish bishop of Jerusalem.[53] This episode is further elaborated in Bedjan's version: Simeon has to be judged by Nicetas' tribunal in a way similar to that in which Jesus was judged by Pilate. The author refers explicitly to the reports of Josepos, that is, Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, III, 32.[54]

A testimony of Cyril of Alexandria shows that, ca. 430, the two legends of the Inventio were already known.[55] We may admit without difficulty that the Latin legend about the young man who dies is the one which inspired Paulinus of Nola in 402.

As all of Helena's legends refer to the Martyrdom of Cyriacus, we have to examine what made that third part of the triptych so popular a legend. It exists in Greek—but in a single very old MS, Sinaiticus 493—and in Armenian, Syriac, Coptic, and Latin.[56] A bad Greek derivation, also unique, was published by Papadopoulos-Kerameus.[57] The original Sinaitic Greek text remains unpublished, even though it is obviously the exact model of the oriental versions. There are only two Greek manuscripts which contain the Cyriacus martyrdom. This throws additional light on the complete absence of any version in Georgian, especially as Georgia was known for its orthodoxy. This scarcity must be connected with the appearance of Alexander's Treatise about the Cross, which was written between 543 and 553,[58] and remained the official orthodox history of the Cross. That text exists only in Greek and Georgian, in a very old translation, and the Greek copies are numerous. It clearly contains an attack upon those stories which introduced false names of bishops and Emperors into the story of the Inventio of the Cross, and it mentions Macarius of Jerusalem and the prologue to Helena's legend, with Constantine on the Danube.

The Danube legend, along with the Inventio, though very common in all these languages, does not occur very often in Armenian. This needs an

explanation. The spread of the Doctrine of Addai in Armenian explains why the MSS which contain Helena's legend are relatively rare. Moreover, the Armenians were the only ones who explicited identified Cyriacus with Cyril. Cyril was obviously bishop of Jerusalem at the time of Julian's persecution. For other reasons, the similarity between the names Cyriacus and Cyril, already noted by N. Akinian,[59] cannot explain in itself the mention of Cyril, martyred by Julian. The martyrdom of Cyriacus is paralleled by the way in which Simeon was executed by Trajan.   The reason for this substitution becomes clear if we look at the inclusion of the whole threefold cycle in the legends about James, the head of the church in Jerusalem, whom, as we already noted, was involved in the sixth-century Syriac MSS. The tradition of James' autocephalic church was inserted in the Chronicon Paschale, written about 532,[60] although lists of consuls into the next century were later added.

The Chronicle begins by stating that Simeon or Simon was the fifteenth patriarch of Jerusalem after James; somewhat further on, it gives the following additional information: Simon the Canaanite, whose surname was Judas, son of Jacob and who was made bishop after James, the Lord's brother, was crucified at the age of 120. A few lines later, the Chronicle gives the names of Simeon, son of Kleopas, who also lived 120 years, as a bishop of Jerusalem according to Eusebius' History. Clearly, the compiler has confounded two different and contradictory traditions. Finally, he speaks about Iustus Barsabbaeus as the third bishop of Jerusalem. This bishop is quoted in an Armenian excerpt attributed to Yostos, fourth bishop of Jerusalem.[61]   The quotation was found in a treatise, "On Christ and the Churches," which has been preserved only in Georgian. According to this version, the author is Barsabbaeus, bishop of Jerusalem.[62]   Lastly, this Barsabbaeus is quoted in the Teaching of Saint Gregory the Illuminator, in the final Armenian recension of Agat'angełos. The sequence of the Apostles Eight to Twelve is: Jacob and Simeon, Thaddaeus and Barsabbas.[63] Thaddaeus is included among the Twelve according to the later versions of his legend in Artaz,[64] and Barsabbaeus becomes Justus according to the Chronicon Paschale, which considers that Iustus Barsabbaeus was the apostle who was not elected when at the command of the Spirit, an election was made in order to fill the place left by Judas, the traitor, in Acts 1:23.[65]

Now, ca. 561 A. D., at the time of Grigor Arcruni's letter to Yostos, bishop of Jerusalem, we find the identification of the two bishops: Yostos

Barsabbaeus, third bishop of Jerusalem, is represented by the autocephalic claims of his late successor Eustochius, who was deposed by Justinian in the middle of the sixth century.[66]   Eustochius borrows the name of Yostos just as Cyril used Judas' appellation Cyriacus. The whole claim is found in this consideration: the autocephaly of Armenia in the middle of the sixth century is founded on a complementary justification already rooted in Jerusalem's ecclesiastical autonomy as being Sion, mother of all the churches,[67] and the see of James, the Lord's brother, who was the first bishop. This seems the reason for which the identification of Cyriacus and Cyril was made explicitly only by the Armenians, under Julian the Apostate.   On the other hand, Leroubna had spoken enough about the first Inventio to pay less attention to Helena's Inventio of the Cross.   The text was less frequently copied in comparison to the wide diffusion of Helena's legend in Greek and the other languages.

If we consider the spread of the Inventio of the Cross, we must draw the conclusion that, already about 540, political changes affected the diffusion of Helena's legend in Armenian Christianity. In a complementary manner, the legend about Cyriacus is transformed into a Passion of Cyril of Jerusalem under Julian the Apostate.   At this time, the legend about Cyriacus is omitted only from the. Greek and Georgian accounts.   In the middle of the sixth century, Jerusalem's claims were adapted to suit previous reflexes of autonomy: they identified Eustochius with Yostos, third bishop of Jerusalem, just as Cyril was made Judas or Simeon, second bishop after James, the founder of the church of Jerusalem. These identifications are to be found only in Armenian documents. The adaptations occurred at least in Jerusalem, when the opposition to Chalcedon provided new reasons for asking for independence. It can easily be guessed that, while the Pascal Chronicle speaks of James as Patriarch of Jerusalem, the claim would have been made after Juvenal came back from Chalcedon, having gained the new dignity of Patriarchate for the See of Jerusalem.

The connection of the martyrdom of Cyriacus with the cycle of the legends about Constantine is not so clear. Without the previous introduction which stresses the identification of Cyriacus with Judas who found the Cross, it would be possible to view the whole martyrdom as an example of an epic martyrdom among many others in the time of Julian. Cyriacus is the son of Anna, and, with a third notable, Admon, he is tortured for his faith and killed by the sword.   It seems probable that some story of the martyrdom had

already existed before some hagiographer for some political purpose thought
it useful to conflate the martyr Cyriacus with Cyriacus who found the Cross.
One must take into account another hagiographical novel which presents in
a similar manner the perseverance of Christianity in Rome in the face of
Julian's apostasy. The very old Bishop Eusebius of Rome is portrayed as the
main figure in the maintenance of the faith, in the so-called Romance of
Julian, as its editor Hoffmann named it.[68] Cyriacus plays the same role in
the church of Jerusalem. Both legends magnify the heads of the original
churches, that of Rome and that of Jerusalem.   What claim could
Constantinople, and even Alexandria or Antioch, present in opposition to such
arguments based on unshakable faith?

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

Let us now look at the third Constantinian legend, that of his baptism
by Sylvester, bishop of Rome. The Roman legend is not independent of its
oriental parallel in which Constantine is always said to have been baptized
by Eusebius of Rome, from the prologue of Helena's Inventio onwards. There
is a sort of missing link which can give us an idea of the fluctuation in the
connection between both legends: that is, the Coptic homily on the Cross,
attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem.[69]

Preserved in three Coptic MSS, this legend is attributed to Cyril of
Jerusalem at the time when controversy was going on about some Samaritan
hereitics in the region of Gaza. The text itself cannot be more recent than
the time of the controversy in it, probably in the seventh century. The
legend gives a stage of development similar to that given by John
Chrysostom and Ambrose on the Inventio of the Cross. It was only because
of an inscription on a piece of leather inserted in the tomb by Joseph of
Arimatheia and Nicodemus that it was possible to identify the true Cross.
No mention is made of a young man who died suddenly, nor of a sick woman
who was healed. The Inventio, however, was only possible through the help
of Judas Cyriacus; in the wide-ranging discussion with the Jewish doctors,
Constantine has to contend with seven leading specialists in Jewish tradition:
Judas, Amin, Abiton, Adoth, Naasson, Yeshoua and Selôm.[70]   There is a
parallel in the manner in which the Emperor is involved in the discussion. In
the Latin B form of the legend about Sylvester, Constantine argues with
twelve Jewish specialists whose names are Abiathar, Ionas, Godolias, Aunan,
Doedh, Chobec, Benoin, Ariel, Tharra, Sileom and Zambres. One can guess
that Abiathar appears as Abiton and Selôm as Sileom; on the other hand,

Godolias is most probably one of the six names included in the Doctrine of Addai for the three main chiefs of the Jewish community under Claudius.

The Coptic legend places the very general controversy in the immediate context of the Inventio of the Cross. In the Latin legend Helena appears in danger of converting to Judaism as she wrote to Constantine a letter sent from Bythinia: the context of that letter gives a clear resume of Arian doctrine on the humanity of Christ. The letter results in the meeting of Constantine with the Jews in Rome in the presence of Sylvester, the protagonist.[71] The primary Roman aim behind the legend is obviously to reject the attribution of the baptism of Constantine to Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Arian bishop who, as a matter of history, baptized Constantine just at the end of the latter's life. That is the reason Helena is said to have come under Judaizing influence in Bythinia, in the region of Nicomedia. On the other hand, as is shown in Paulinus' version of the Inventio of the Cross, and in its Latin model, Rome was already in a position to reject the confusion between Eusebius of Rome and Eusebius of Nicomedia prevalent in the East. This oriental confusion was espoused in order to play down the Arian tendencies of Constantine, but, as we have seen, it was connected with Jerusalem's rivalry with Rome, as well.

The form taken by Sylvester's legend is no less complicated than that of the Inventio. Of the two Latin recensions which he has analyzed, Levison considers genuine the one which gives the full names of Bythinia and those of the two Roman philosophers, Craton and Zenophilus, appointed by Constantine to face the Jewish objections.[72] The second version of the legend does not mention these two philosophers representing the emperor, nor does it specify Bythinia as the place where Helena was in danger of being converted to Judaism. I think the influence of that version may be connected with the Coptic versions of the Inventio, where Constantine himself takes part in the controversy.

The origin of the Sylvester reports has already been dated to approximately 420 A. D.[73] It begins with some Roman questions about fasting on Saturday and about the new names given by Sylvester to the days of the week in order to eradicate the pagan divinities whose names were still in use., These typically Roman elements are found in the Greek version of the Sylvester legend as well as in the Syriac, which is preserved in a somewhat shorter form as part of the compilation attributed to Zacharias the Rhetor, completed ca. 565 A. D.[74]

The only way we could analyze in what milieu the Sylvester legend was received and translated in the East is by consulting the first book of Zacharias. It contains the following presentation of ancient facts in a MS, the Add. 17202, dated ca. 600 A. D. The legend is inserted between the tale of Joseph and Aseneth and the Inventio of Saint Stephen, dated 415 A. D. The second book opens with documents from the council of Ephesus and the acts of the Seven Sleepers.[75] It is noteworthy that the Latin and Greek texts introduce the Sylvester legend referring not only to the principal churches of that time, that is, Antioch, Alexandria and Rome, but also to Jerusalem and Ephesus.[76] The omission of Constantinople is surely a point of archaic interest. Ephesus was the center of Christian preoccupation thanks to the 431 council and the 449 "Robbery." In later times, it would have been unlikely for Ephesus to have such importance as to figure in the prologue of the Sylvester legend. It is most likely that Zacharias, in his Syriac version, used Greek compiler who quite adequately made the connection between the legend of Saint Stephen in 415 and that of Sylvester. The spread of Sylvester's legend in the Orient may have begun as early as the 430s. The theological arguments in the discussion with the Jews could have been brought out after Chalcedon, as Levison remarked, but they do not disprove the Apollinarist discussions of about 400 A. D.[77] Levison's intuition concerning the Latin style of the legend as a compilation of Arnobius Iunior, who died in 450,[78] confirms its diffusion in the fourth decade of the fifth century.

The central event in the Sylvester legend is the healing of Constantine's leprosy by holy baptism from Sylvester himself. One might wonder why this Roman legend specifies that Sylvester received the colobium—ancestor of the pallium—from Saint James the Apostle, through the kindness of Bishop Euphrosynus of Pamphylia.[79] Here seems to me to be an insight into the relationship between Rome and Jerusalem. It is not yet James, the brother of the Lord, who is meant by that text, but the Apostle who was thrown from the pinnacle of the temple. The other miracles in the Sylvester legend are the purification of various pagan shrines by exorcism: likewise the dragon of the Tarpeia Rock, and the episode of the magic death of the Bull of Zambres and its resurrection by Sylvester's prayer.

Abridged at many points but enlarged with passages of the Passio Eusignii, the Sylvester legend occurs twice in Armenian as an appendix to the translation of the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, by Philo Tirakac'i.[80]

Certainly earlier, the influence of this legend was as important as that of the Inventio stories on the structure of Agat'angełos.

The earliest form of Agat'angełos, with its very strong Byzantine orientation, cannot be understood without some appreciation of the fact, that Trdat had no less rich an experience in personal conversion and penance than Constantine himself in his being healed of leprosy. Major exorcisms can be found in every legend: King Trdat, for example, is transformed into a wild pig. This is in no way inferior to the leprosy which covers Constantine. On the other hand, it is quite certain that Agat'angełos, in his first edition, already knew of the threefold Inventio of the Cross. At one stage of its development, the legend presents the conversion of the whole of the Caucasus. This version, with its strong Greek affinities, could not have been completed before Zenon's reign, before which the official Greek church was oriented along the Henotikon lines, even in Georgia and Albania.[81] At this time, as we saw at the beginning of this paper, Sylvester appears as bishop of Rome before Eusebius. This type of commingling of two different legends into a single pseudohistory also appears in the Latin Inventio of the Cross, where a bishop, most probably Macarius, is said to have died before Judas Cyriacus was made bishop in his place. It is an innovation of the Greco-Arabic version of Agat'angełos to have Constantine being converted before Trdat: in the letter he sent to the Armenian king, the Roman emperor invites Trdat, after hearing of the latter's conversion;[82] The chronology presupposed by that legend is as follows: the torture of Gregory by Trdat coincides with Diocletian's persecutions; that is, about 303 A. D. Afterwards, the old Emperor, at the end of his life, about 311 A. D., searches for the most beautiful girl in the Empire to become his wife. The messengers who discover the virgin Hripsimē in a convent in Rome announce this news to the Emperor, but the nuns have already escaped to Armenia when the Emperor's guards come back to Rome. Trdat would have found Hripsimē in Armenia about 313, and the martyrdom of St. Hripsimē would have occurred in 315. According to this version, Gregory remained in the well for 13 years. Theoretically, there is no contradiction in admitting the conversion of the Armenian king about 316, because 13 or 14 years are the oldest figures given in the versions of Agat'angełos. If Constantine was baptized by Sylvester in 313, Trdat could have been invited ca. 320 to Rome, when the pseudo-historic Eusebius was bishop of Rome. So, the coherence of the apparently contradictory legends is preserved.

Later, in the definitive edition of Agat'angełos, the chronology is completely changed. There is record of the virgins of Rome at the beginning of Diocletian's attacks upon Christianity, that is, in 303. Accordingly, the author has to find other reasons for placing Gregory in the well for 15 years, that is from 288 onwards. In that year, Trdat hears that Anak had killed Xosrov by treachery and learns that Gregory is his cousin, and he decides to throw Gregory into the well. The author could have found some aid as well in the fact that the Roman See really had a pope named Eusebius in 309. In this last development of Agat'angełos, of course, we do not find any mention of Sylvester. It is now Trdat who learns of Constantine's conversion ten years after he, the Armenian king, had converted to Christianity. The roles are reversed, and inasmuch as Armenia was under Sasanian rule, it was indeed safer to claim Iranian origin for both Gregory and Trdat, and conversion to Christianity independent of Greek hegemony. The version which was used by Yovhannēs Kat'ołikos of Bagaran[83] is the last stage in the growth of Agat'angełos' story.

At this time, an alliance with Maurice in Constantine appears imminent, the names of Sylvester and Eusebius disappear. When referring to the representation of the consecration of Gregory by Leontios of Caesarea,[84] the rearranger of the legend makes the ingenious discovery of a direct dependence on Leontius of Rome [sic!] in the ecclesiastical sphere, and an immediate dependence of Constantinople and Constantine in the political sphere.   This very clever transformation could have had two main motivations.

The first is the coincidence of the name of Leontios of Caesarea with the champion of Chalcedonism, Pope Leo the First; at the same time, this operation avoided the objection of two different people for the bishop of Rome at the time of Constantine's conversion. There was also some reason to imagine Constantine in Constantinople rather than in Rome if we consider that the Armenian version of Sylvester's account uses the Passio Eusignii, in which the founding of Constantinople is described as occurring very soon after the conversion of the Emperor. This is an addition reason for putting Constantine's conversion after that of Trdat. The result of this kind of interaction by which Church and Empire are substituted serves the interests of the independence of the Armenian ecclesiastical tradition, far removed from Byzantine ecclesiatical power but included in the sphere of the Greek Empire for mutual aid against Persian aggression.

At the end of this brief review we may conclude that a symbolic story is no less useful for writing history than an official report by a good historian is. The inherited symbols were adapted with truly remarkable sensitivity to the changes in political and religious trends. The manner in which the Armenians received the Greek symbol of the conversion of Emperor and Empire shows how adequately they understood to what end those emblematic representations were used.

NOTES

[1]F. J. Doelger, "Die Taufe Konstantine und ihre Probleme," Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit (Freiburg i. Br., 1913), 377-447, 403-404

[2]Ibid., 405-406.

[3]Ibid., 401-407.

[4]W. Levison, "Konstantinische Schenkung und Silvester-Legende," Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle (Vatican, 1923), 2.159-247.

[5]E. Bihain, "L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG 413)," Byzantion (1973), 43.264-296. For the connection between both visions, see J. Vogt, "Berichte über Kreuzerscheinungen aus dem 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.," Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves (1949), 9.593-606.

[6]Lactantius, De mortibus persecutorum 44.6 (ed. J. Moreau, Sources Chretiennes; Paris, 1954), 127, 433-436.

[7]Eusebius, Ecclesiastica historia 10.8.18-19 (ed. Schwartz; Leipzig, 1908), 898, and the interpretation of H. Gregoire, "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la 'Vita Constantini'," Byzantion (1938), 13.574ff.

[8]Cf. J. Moreau, "Sur la vision de Constantin (312)," Revue des Etudes Anciennes (1953), 55.308-310.

[9]Eusebius, Vita Constantini 1.28-30 (ed. F. Winkelmann; Berlin, 1975), 30.

[10]Rufinus, Historia Ecclesiastica 9.1-3 (ed. Schwartz), Eusebius'

Historia, 827-835.

[11]Socrates, Ecclesiatical History 1.2 (ed. R. Hussey, Oxford, 1853), 1.11.

[12]Sokratay Sk'olastikosi Ekełec'akan Patmut'iwn (ed. M. Tēr-Movsessian, Vałaršapat, 1897), 4.

[13]Gelasius, Kirchengeschichte 1.5 (ed. G. Loeschke and M. Heinemann; Leipzig, 1908), 10. M. Gedeon, Anekdota Byzantina fasc. 1, 32, Ekklesiastike Aletheia (Constantinople, 1884), 4. Against F. Scheidweiler's position in favor of the posteriority of Constantine's Vita in "Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia," Byzantinische Zeitschrift (1953), 46.277-301, see M. van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule 'Sur la Croix' d'Alexandre de Chypre et sa version géorgienne," Bedi Kartlisa (1979), 37.102-132, esp. 125.

[14]Gelasius, Kirchengeschichte, 10.

[15]Sozomenus, Ecclesiastical History 1.3.1-5 (ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen; Berlin, 1960), 11.

[16]Philostorgius, Kirchengeschichte 1.6. (ed. J. Bidez; Leipzig, 1913), 7.

[17]Ibid., 7, quoted from Photius and the Vita.

[18]Ibid., 3.26.51-52.

[19]P. Batiffol, "Un historiographe anonyme arien di IVe siecle," Romische Quartalschrift (1895), 9.57-97.

[20]It is therefore quite normal that coins may have been struck in 350 with hoc signo victor eris: cf. H. Gregoire and P. Orgels, "S. Gallicanus, consul et martyr, dans la Passion des SS. Jean et Paul et sa vision 'constantinienne du crucifié'," Byzantion (1954), 579-605, esp. 596-599.

[21]E. Nestlé, "Die Kreuzauffindungslegende," Byzantinische Zeitschrift (1895), 4.324.

[22]R. Devreesse, "Une collection hiérosolymitaine au Sinai," Revue Biblique (1938), 47.555-558.

[23]Cl. Sanspeur, "La version arménienne de Uisio Constantini BHG 396," Handēs Amsoreay 88 (1974) 316.

[24]References to the editions in M. van Esbroeck, Les plus anciens homéliaires géorgiens (Louvain-la-neuve, 1975), 99-100.

[25]E. Nestlé, De sancta Cruce (Berlin, 1889), 11 (1196 A. D.) and P. Bedjan, Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum (Paris, 1890), 1.326-343.

[26]F. W. K. Mueller and W. Lentz, "Sogdishe Texte II," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1934), 19.504-520.

[27]A. Holder, Inventio sanctae Crucis (Lipsiae, 1889), 1-13.

[28]Ibid., 1, ll. 17-18.

[29]Dölger, Die Taufe, 381-385.

[30]G. Garitte, Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange (Vatican, 1946), 100, "Vita graeca," par. 167.

[31]Cf. Garitte, Documents, p. 328.

[32]Ibid., "Vita Graeca," p. 113, par. 189.

[33]Patmut'iwn Agat'angełosi, 833. (Ed. Tēr Mkrtč'ian; Tbilisi, 1909), 434, 2-3. G. Lafontaine, La version grecque ancienne du livre arménien d'Agathange (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1973), 320. Translation by R. W. Thomson, Agathangelos' History of the Armenians (Albany, 1976), 367-369.

[34]Garitte, "Vita Graeca," Documents, 169 gives the name of Sylvester, and 182 that of Eusebius.

[35]Eusebius, Vita Constantini, 3.24-41. (Ed. F. Winkelmann; Berlin, 1975) 94-102.

[36]Cyril of Jerusalem. Catechesis 4.10 and 13.4, Patrologia Graeca, 35, cols. 467 and 686.

[37]Johannes Chrysostomus, In Iohannen 85, PG 59, col. 461, 9-18.

[38]Ambrosius, De obitu Theodosii, 45-48 (ed. O. Faller; Wien, 1955), 394-397.

[39]Rufinus, Historia ecclesiastica, 10.7 (ed. Th. Mommsen, Eusebius Werke, 2.2 (Leipzig, 1908), 969-970.

[40]"Sancti pontii meropii Paulini Nolani," Epistolae 23.5 (ed. G. de Hartel; Wien, 1894), 272-273.

[41]Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, 1.17 (ed. R. Hussey), 104-107. Theodoret, Historia Ecclesiastica 1.17 (ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler Berlin, 1954), 64-69.

[42]Sozomenus, Historia Ecclesiastica (ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen; Berlin, 1960), 47-49.

[43]A. Holder, Inventio, 1.14.

[44]For instance in Nestlé, Die Kreuzauffindung, 11-12, 324.

[45]N. Pigulevsky, "Katalog sirijskix rukopisej Leningrada," Palestinskij Sbornik 69 (1960), 140-143.

[46]Nestlé, De sancta Cruce, 25-36.

[47]Bedjan, Acta Martyrum (Paris, 1890), 326-343.

[48]The texts of the London MS were published by W. Cureton, Ancient Syriac Documents (London, 1864), 5-23 for the Doctrine; 24-35 for the Doctrine of the Apostles; 36-41 for that of S. Peter (all in Syriac).   The Leningrad Codex is used for the Doctrina Addai by G. Phillips, The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle (London, 1876), 1-53.

[49]N. Pigulevsky, Le martyre de Saint Cyriaque de Jersalem, in Revue de l'Orient Chretien, 7.26 (1927-1928), 306.

[50]Cureton, Ancient Syriac, 32-33 (Syr.).

[51]Nestlé, De sancta Cruce, 7-20.   The prologue of Leningrad is perhaps older than the Latin one from Paris. It remains unpublished and relates the Vision with the stars.

[52]Nestlé, De sancta Cruce, 21-25. P. Bedjan, Acta Martyrum (Paris, 1892), 3.175-187.

[53]Nestlé, De sancta Cruce, 9-11.

[54]Bedjan, Acta Martyrum, 3.183-187.

[55]Cyril of Alexandria, Commentarium in Zaccharia, 114 in PG, vol. 72, col. 272, quoted by L.-J. Tixeront, Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse (Paris, 1888), 169, note 3.

[56]The references to the editions in the Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis (Brussels, 1910), no. 233 Syr., 234 (Coptic), 235 (Ethiopic), 236 (Armenian). The Syriac version of Leningrad is published by N. Pigulevsky, Le martyre de S. Cyriaque, 332-349, and completes Guidi's edition of the London MS. The Armenian version was published by N. Akinian, "Die Passio S. Cyrilli (Judae Cyriaci) in altarmenischen Ueberstzung," in Handēs

Amsoreay, 62 (1948), 145-155.   The Greek model of the eighth century is
unpublished.   A Latin version is Acta Sanctorum Maii (Antwerp, 1680), 1.439-
451, by Daniel Papebroch.

[57]F. Halkin, Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca (Brussels, 1957), no.
465.

[58]Cf. M. van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule 'Sur la croix'," 106-109.

[59]N. Akinian, "Die Passios Cyrilli," col. 130-131.

[60]Cf. K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinische Litteratur von
Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (Munich, 1897), 337-339.

[61]Chronicon Paschale (ed. L. Dindorf; Bonn, 1832), 1.460, 470-472.
The Armenian text of Yostos is edited by N. Akinian, Untersuchungen zu den
sogennanten Kanones des Hl. Sahak und das armenische Kirchenjahr am
Anfang des 7. Jahrhunderts (Wien, 1955), 191-193.

[62]M. van Esbroeck, Les plus anciens homéliaires, 338-340.

[63]Patmut'iwn Agat'angełosi, par. 686, p. 355.

[64]M. van Esbroeck, "Le roi Sanatrouk et l'apôtre Thaddée," REArm 9
(1972), 279-283.

[65]Chronicon Pascale, 472.

[66]Cf. F. Diekamp, Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten
Jahrhundert und das funfte allgemeine Concil (Münster, 1899), 29-32.

[67]F. Diekamp, Hippolytos von Theben (Münster, 1898), 96-113.

[68]J. G. E. Hoffmann, Iulianos der Abtrunnige. Syrische erzahlungen
(Leiden, 1880).   Eusebius and Constantininus and his sons are mentioned in
the title, 5.

[69]E. A. Wallis Budge, Miscellaneous Coptic Texts (London, 1915), 183-
230 on the Brit. Mus. Or. 6799.   Two other MSS are preserved in the Pierpont
Morgan Library, no. 600 and 599.

[70]I found these names in Pierpont Morgan 600, 67, line 7.

[71]B. Mombritius, Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum (Paris, 1910),
2.508-531, esp. 515.

[72]For the differences between the versions, see Levison, Kon-

stantinische Schenkung, 166-200.

[73]Dölger, Die Tauffe, 415-416 where the discussion on the fastdays is connected with a letter of Innocentius I in March 416.

[74]E. W. Brooks, Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta (Paris, 1919), 1.i-iv.

[75]Ibid., vii.

[76]F. Combefis, Illustrium Christi Martyrum lecti triumphi (Paris, 1660), 259. Levison, Konstantinische Schenkung, 230. Mombritius, 508.

[77]Dölger, Die Tauffe, 409-414.

[78]Levison, Konstantinische Schenkung, 205-206.

[79]Mombritius, Sanctuarium, 509, 1. 50.

[80]The demonstration was made by B. Sarkissean, Tesut'iwn Sełbestrosi Patmut'ean (Venice, 1893), 15-27.   M. Ter Movsessian, ed., Sokratay Sk'olastikosi 691-799.

[81]Cf. M. van Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque de l'Agathange et sa portée pour l'Histoire du développement de la légende," Handēs Amsoreay 90 (1976), col. 497-506.

[82]Garitte, Documents 328.

[83]Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque de l'Agathange," Analecta Bollandiana 95 (1977), 293-357.

[84]Garitte, Documents, 222, 314-317. Some doubt has been cast on the existence of a council at Caesaria attended by twenty bishops. These doubts arise from a study of the manuscript tradition of the collections of Canons in Syriac. Garitte, 131, quotes a Syriac synod indicated by Lebon. The nonexistence is proved by H. Kaufhold, Die Rechtssamlung des Gabriel von Basra und ihr Verhältnis zu den anderen juristischen Sammelwerken der Nestorianer (Berlin, 1976), 10-14.